

SETS AVOIDING SQUARES IN $\mathbb{Z}_m$

Mikhail Gabdullin ¹

Abstract

We prove that for all squarefree m and any set $A \subset \mathbb{Z}_m$ such that $A - A$ does not contain non-zero squares the bound $|A| \leq m^{1/2}(3n)^{1.5n}$ holds, where n denotes the number of odd prime divisors of m .

1 Introduction

It was a conjecture of L. Lovász that if S is any sequence of positive integers of positive asymptotic density, then $S - S$ necessarily contains a square. A. Sárközy [1] proved it, showing that for any $B \subset [N]$ such that $B - B$ avoids squares we have

$$|B| \ll N(\log N)^{-1/3+\varepsilon}.$$

Currently the best upper bound is

$$|B| \ll \frac{N}{(\log N)^{\log \log \log \log N/12}},$$

which was obtained by J. Pintz, W. L. Steiger, and E. Szemerédi [2]. The method of that work also gives the similar upper bound to the case of k th powers; see [3]. On the other hand, I. Ruzsa [4] constructed an example of a set $B \subset [N]$ which possess the mentioned property and has size $|B| \gg N^\gamma$, where $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{\log 7}{\log 65}) = 0,733077\dots$

With this connection it is natural to consider the correspondence problem in cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}_m$. This question is also explored by I. Ruzsa and M. Matolcsi in [5]. For sets $A \subset \mathbb{Z}_m$ with the property that $A - A$ avoids cubic residues they showed that

$$|A| = O_\varepsilon(m^{1/2+\varepsilon})$$

for all squarefree m , and

$$|A| \leq m^{1-\delta},$$

where $\delta = 0.119\dots$, for all m . If $A - A$ avoids squares, they proved the bounds

$$|A| < m^{1/2} \tag{1}$$

¹The work is supported by the grant from Russian Science Foundation (Project 14-11-00702).

for all squarefree m which have prime divisors $1 \pmod{4}$ only, and

$$|A| \leq m e^{-c\sqrt{\log m}}$$

for all squarefree m .

In this paper we investigate the squarefree modular case for sets avoiding squares. Firstly, we would like to discuss briefly known lower bounds. It was shown by S. Cohen [6] that there exists such a set of size at least $\frac{1}{2}(\log_2 m + o(1))$ for all m which have prime divisors $1 \pmod{4}$ only, while S. Graham and C. Ringrose [7] proved the lower bound $\log p \log \log \log p$ for infinitely many primes $m = p$.

We present a short proof of the bound obtained in [6]. Let us begin with the case $m = p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Consider the complete graph $G = (V, E)$ with $V = \mathbb{Z}_p$ and the partition $E = E_1 \sqcup E_2$, where $E_1 = \{(x, y) : x - y \text{ is a square}\}$ and $E_2 = E \setminus E_1$. Then, by Ramsey's theorem for two colours (see, for instance, [8], Theorem 6.9), one can find a complete monochromatic subgraph $G' = (V', E')$ of our graph G with $|V'| = n$ whenever $|V| = p \geq \binom{2n-2}{n-1}$. We thus see that there exists such a subgraph with $n \geq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 p$. If $E \subset E_2$, then, obviously, the set V' of all its vertices gives an example we need; if $E \subset E_1$, then for any non-residue $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ we get such an example in the form $\xi V'$. To get the bound for the mentioned more general case, observe that if $m = \prod_{i=1}^k p_i$ and $A_i \subset \mathbb{Z}_{p_i}$ possess the property that $A_i - A_i$ avoids squares, then, obviously, the set $A_1 \times \dots \times A_k$ possess it too. The claim follows.

Our main result is the following.

Theorem. *For all squarefree m and $A \subset \mathbb{Z}_m$ such that $A - A$ does not contain non-zero squares we have*

$$|A| \leq m^{1/2} (3n)^{1.5n},$$

where n denotes the number of odd prime divisors of m .

Corollary 1. *Let m and A obey the conditions of the Theorem. If $n = o(\frac{\log m}{\log \log m})$, then*

$$|A| \leq m^{1/2+o(1)};$$

if $n \leq (\frac{1}{3} - \varepsilon) \frac{\log m}{\log \log m}$, then

$$|A| \leq m^{1-1.5\varepsilon+o(1)}.$$

Corollary 2. *We have*

$$|A| \leq m^{-c \log m / \log \log m}$$

for all m and A obeying the conditions of the Theorem.

The Theorem will be proven in Section 2. Corollary 1 follows immediately from the Theorem; Corollary 2 will be proven in Section 3.

2 Proof of the Theorem

Without loss of generality we may assume that m is odd. We induct on n . For the case $n = 1$, i.e., $m = p$ is prime, we have the bound $|A| \leq m^{1/2}$. If $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, then $|A| \leq 1$; suppose $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. We give an elegant and folklore proof: let us assume that $|A| > m^{1/2}$ and fix a non-residue $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}_m$. Consider the map $\varphi: A^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$, $\varphi(a, b) = a + \xi b$. By the pigeonhole principle, there are two distinct pairs (a_1, b_1) and (a_2, b_2) such that $\varphi(a_1, b_1) = \varphi(a_2, b_2)$, i.e., $\xi = (a_1 - a_2)(b_2 - b_1)^{-1}$, which means that at least one of the differences $a_1 - a_2$ and $b_1 - b_2$ is non-residue modulo m , and the claim follows.

Now assume that $n \geq 2$ and the claim is true for all $l < n$. Let $p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_n$ be all prime divisors of m . Denote by χ_j quadratic character of $\mathbb{Z}_{p_j}$. Since each difference $a_1 - a_2$ of distinct elements of A is non-residue by at least one modulo p_i , we have

$$|A| = \sum_{a_1, a_2 \in A} \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + \chi_j(a_1 - a_2)) = |A|^2 + \sum_D \sum_{a_1, a_2 \in A} \chi_D(a_1 - a_2),$$

where D runs over all non-empty subsets of $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\chi_D(x) = \prod_{j \in D} \chi_j(x)$. Denote $\sigma = 1 - |A|^{-1}$. Then we may rewrite the last equality as follows:

$$|A|^2 \sigma = - \sum_D \sum_{a_1, a_2 \in A} \chi_D(a_1 - a_2).$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz, we see that

$$|A|^2 \sigma \leq \sum_D |A|^{1/2} S_D^{1/2},$$

where

$$S_D = \sum_{a \in A} \left| \sum_{b \in A} \chi_D(a - b) \right|^2.$$

Thus

$$|A|^{3/2}\sigma \leq \sum_D S_D^{1/2}. \quad (2)$$

Now we have to estimate the sums S_D . Fix a set D of size d . Denote for the brevity $p_D = \prod_{j \in D} p_j$ and

$$G_d = (3n)^{1.5(n-d)}. \quad (3)$$

For all residues x modulo p_D we set

$$A_x = \{a \in A : a \equiv x \pmod{p_D}\}.$$

One can think of elements of A_x as residues modulo mp_D^{-1} , and the difference of distinct elements of A_x is non-residue modulo mp_D^{-1} . Then by the induction hypothesis we have

$$|A_x| \leq m^{1/2} p_D^{-1/2} G_d.$$

Obviously $A = \bigsqcup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{p_D}} A_x$ and all elements of A_x give the same contribution to S_D . We thus see that

$$\begin{aligned} S_D &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{p_D}} \sum_{a \in A_x} \left| \sum_{b \in A} \chi_D(x - b) \right|^2 = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{p_D}} |A_x| \left| \sum_{b \in A} \chi_D(x - b) \right|^2 \leq \\ &= m^{1/2} p_D^{-1/2} G_d \sum_{b_1, b_2 \in A} \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{p_D}} \prod_{j \in D} \chi_j(a - b_1) \chi_j(a - b_2) = \\ &= m^{1/2} p_D^{-1/2} G_d \sum_{b_1, b_2 \in A} \prod_{j \in D} \sum_{a_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{p_j}} \chi_j(a_j - b_1) \chi_j(a_j - b_2). \end{aligned}$$

Let us compute the inner sum. For the sake of brevity we introduce the following definition: a pair (b_1, b_2) is said to be *special* modulo p if $b_1 \equiv b_2 \pmod{p}$. We have $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{p_j}} \chi_j(a - b_1) \chi_j(a - b_2) = p_j - 1$ if (b_1, b_2) is a special pair modulo p_j and

$$\sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{p_j}} \chi_j(a - b_1) \chi_j(a - b_2) = \sum_{a \neq b_2} \chi_j \left(1 + \frac{b_2 - b_1}{a - b_2} \right) = \sum_{a \neq 1} \chi_j(a) = -1$$

otherwise.

Denote by B_r the contribution of pairs which are special exactly for r modulus, $0 \leq r \leq d$, to the outer sum of the bound for S_D . We thus have

$$S_D \leq m^{1/2} p_D^{-1/2} G_d \sum_{r=0}^d B_r. \quad (4)$$

Obviously,

$$B_0 \leq |A|^2. \quad (5)$$

To obtain an estimate for the sum S_D it remains to handle with B_r for $r \geq 1$. Fix a set $D' \subset D$, $D' = \{i_1, \dots, i_r\}$, of numbers of special modulus. The contribution of pairs which are special exactly these modulus to B_r is at most $p_{D'} = \prod_{j \in D'} p_j$. The amount of such pairs does not exceed the number of solution of the congruence $x \equiv y \pmod{p_{D'}}$, $x, y \in A$, which is at most $|A| m^{1/2} p_{D'}^{-1/2} G_r$ by the induction hypothesis. Thus, the contribution of pairs which are special modulus p_j , $j \in D'$, to B_r is at most $|A| m^{1/2} p_{D'}^{1/2} G_r$. Therefore for all $r \geq 1$ we have

$$B_r \leq |A| m^{1/2} G_r \sum_{D' \subset D, |D'|=r} p_{D'}^{1/2}. \quad (6)$$

Substituting (5) and (6) into (4), we see that for all $|D| = d$

$$S_D \leq m^{1/2} p_D^{-1/2} G_d |A|^2 + m |A| G_d \sum_{r=1}^d G_r \sum_{D' \subset D, |D'|=r} (p_{D'}/p_D)^{1/2},$$

or

$$S_D \leq m^{1/2} p_D^{-1/2} G_d |A|^2 + m |A| G_d \sum_{r=1}^d G_r \sum_{D' \subset D, |D'|=d-r} p_{D'}^{-1/2}.$$

This implies

$$S_D^{1/2} \leq m^{1/4} p_D^{-1/4} G_d^{1/2} |A| + |A|^{1/2} m^{1/2} G_d^{1/2} \sum_{r=1}^d G_r^{1/2} \sum_{D' \subset D, |D'|=d-r} p_{D'}^{-1/4}.$$

Substituting this estimate into (2), we obtain

$$|A| \sigma \leq |A|^{1/2} m^{1/4} T_1 + m^{1/2} T_2, \quad (7)$$

where

$$T_1 = \sum_{d=1}^n G_d^{1/2} \sum_{|D|=d} p_D^{-1/4},$$

$$T_2 = \sum_{D \subseteq [n]} G_{|D|}^{1/2} \sum_{D' \subset D} G_{|D|-|D'|}^{1/2} p_{D'}^{-1/4}.$$

It remains to estimate the sums T_1 and T_2 . We firstly handle with T_1 . Since $p_1 \geq 3$ and the function $u^{-1/4}$ is concave, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n p_j^{-1/4} &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n (2j+1)^{-1/4} \leq 0.5 \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{2j}^{2j+2} u^{-1/4} du = \\ &= \frac{2}{3} ((2n+2)^{3/4} - 2^{3/4}) < \frac{2}{3} (2n)^{3/4} < 1.13n^{3/4}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Hence, recalling the definition (3) of G_d ,

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &\leq \sum_{d=1}^n G_d^{1/2} \frac{1}{d!} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n p_j^{-1/4} \right)^d \leq \sum_{d=1}^n \frac{1.13^d}{d!} (3n)^{0.75(n-d)} n^{0.75d} \\ &= (3n)^{0.75n} \sum_{d=1}^n 3^{-0.75d} \frac{1.13^d}{d!} \leq 0.65(3n)^{0.75n}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Now we are going to estimate T_2 . We may rewrite

$$T_2 = \sum_{D' \subset [n]} p_{D'}^{-1/4} \sum_{D \supset D'} G_{|D|}^{1/2} G_{|D|-|D'|}^{1/2}.$$

We begin with an estimate for the inner sum. By (3), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{D \supset D'} G_{|D|}^{1/2} G_{|D|-|D'|}^{1/2} &= (3n)^{1.5n} \sum_{D \supset D'} (3n)^{-1.5(|D|-|D'|/2)} \leq \\ &= (3n)^{1.5n} \sum_{r=|D'|+1}^n n^{r-|D'|} (3n)^{-1.5(r-|D'|/2)} = \\ &= (3n)^{1.5n+0.75|D'|} n^{-|D'|} \sum_{r=|D'|+1}^n 3^{-1.5r} n^{-r/2} \leq \\ &= (3n)^{1.5n+0.75|D'|} n^{-|D'|} 3^{-1.5(|D'|+1)} n^{-(|D'|+1)/2} (1 - 3^{-1.5} n^{-1/2})^{-1} \leq \\ &= 0.16(3n)^{1.5n-0.75|D'|}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, thanks to (8), we obtain

$$T_2 \leq 0.16(3n)^{1.5n} \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} (3n)^{-0.75l} \sum_{|D'|=l} p_{D'}^{-1/4} \leq$$

$$0.16(3n)^{1.5n} \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} 3^{-0.75l} \frac{1.13^l}{l!} \leq 0.27(3n)^{1.5n}.$$

In light of this and (9), we see from (7) that

$$L := |A|^{1/2} \left(|A|^{1/2} \sigma - 0.65m^{1/4}(3n)^{0.75n} \right) \leq 0.27m^{1/2}(3n)^{1.5n} =: R.$$

Assume that

$$|A| > m^{1/2}(3n)^{1.5n}.$$

But $n \geq 2$; hence, $m \geq 15$, $|A| \geq 6^3 \sqrt{15} > 100$ and $\sigma = 1 - |A|^{-1} \geq 0.99$. Therefore

$$L > (0.99 - 0.65)m^{1/2}(3n)^{1.5n} > R,$$

a contradiction. This completes the proof.

3 Proof of Corollary 2

The idea of the proof is to combine the Theorem with another upper bound on $|A|$ which is decreasing on n .

Denote $m' = \prod_{p|m, p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}} p$. We may assume that $m' \geq m^{1/2}$ (say), since otherwise we have $|A| \leq m'(m/m')^{1/2} \leq m^{3/4}$ by (1). For similar reasons we see that it suffices to prove the claim for the case $m' = m$.

We will use the graph theoretic approach suggested by M. Matolcsi and I. Ruzsa [5]. Recall that product (V, E) of directed graphs $D_i = (V_i, E_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, is defined as follows: we set $V = V_1 \times \dots \times V_k$ and say that an ordered pair of distinct vertices $((x_1, \dots, x_k), (y_1, \dots, y_k)) \in V^2$ belongs to E if and only if we have either $x_i = y_i$ or $(x_i, y_i) \in E_i$ for all i . A directed graph is called a tournament if exactly one of $(x, y) \in E$ and $(y, x) \in E$ is true for all $x \neq y$.

We need the following result of N. Alon.

Lemma ([9], Theorem 1.2) *Let $(V_1, E_1), \dots, (V_k, E_k)$ be directed graphs with maximum outdegrees $d_1, \dots, d_k$ respectively and (V, E) be its product. Suppose that S is a subset of V with the property that for every ordered*

pair $(u_1, \dots, u_k)$ and $(v_1, \dots, v_k)$ of members of S we have $(u_i, v_i) \in E_i$ for some i . Then

$$|S| \leq \prod_{i=1}^k (d_i + 1).$$

Note that in [8] only the case $(V_1, E_1) = \dots = (V_k, E_k)$ is considered but the proof immediately extends to different directed graphs. For completeness, we reproduce the proof given there.

Proof of the lemma. We may think of each set V_i as a set of integers. Associate each member $v = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$ of S with a polynomial $P_v \in \mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ defined by

$$P_v(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j \in N(v_i)} (x_i - j),$$

where $N(v_i) = \{u \in V_i : (v_i, u) \in E_i\}$ is the set of all out-neighbors of v_i .

Since $v_i \notin N(v_i)$, we see that $P_v(v_1, \dots, v_k) \neq 0$ for all $v = (v_1, \dots, v_k) \in S$. On the other hand, by the definition of S , we have $P_v(u) = 0$ whenever $u \in S$ and $u \neq v$. It follows that the set of polynomial $\{P_v : v \in S\}$ is linearly independent (since if $\sum_{v \in S} c_v P_v(x_1, \dots, x_k) = 0$ then, by substituting $(x_1, \dots, x_k) = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$ we conclude that $c_v = 0$). But each P_v is a polynomial of degree at most d_i in variable x_i ; hence, the number of these polynomials does not exceed the dimension of the space of polynomials in k variables with this property, which is $\prod_{i=1}^k (d_i + 1)$. This concludes the proof.

Now assume that $A \subset \mathbb{Z}_m$ is such that $A - A$ does not contain non-zero squares. We consider the product $(\mathbb{Z}_m, E)$ of the tournaments $(\mathbb{Z}_p, E_p)$, $p|m$, where $(x, y) \in E_p$ iff $x - y$ is a square in $\mathbb{Z}_p$ (recall that we assume all p to be $3 \pmod{4}$). Then for any a, b we can find $p|m$ with $(a - b) \pmod{p} \in E_p$ (since $(b, a) \notin E$). We thus see from the lemma that $|A| \leq \prod_{i=1}^n (p_i + 1)/2 = m2^{-n} \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + 1/p_i) \leq m2^{-cn}$ for some $c > 0$. Combining this with the Theorem, we get $|A| \leq m \cdot \min(2^{-cn}, m^{-1/2}(3n)^{1.5n})$, and the claim follows.

References

- [1] A. Sárközy, On difference sets of integers, I, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. 31 (1978), 125-149.

- [2] J. Pintz, W. L. Steiger, E. Szemerédi, On sets of natural numbers whose difference set contains no squares, J. London Math. Soc. 1988, s2-37 (2), 219-231.
- [3] A. Balog, J. Pelikan, J. Pintz, E. Szemerédi, Difference sets without k th powers, Acta Math. Hungar. 65 (2), 1994, 165-187.
- [4] I. Ruzsa, Difference sets without squares, Periodica Mathematica Hungarica, Vol. 15 (3), 1984, 205-209.
- [5] M. Matolcsi, I. Ruzsa, Difference sets and positive exponential sums II: Quadratic and cubic residues in cyclic groups: preprint.
- [6] S.D. Cohen, Clique numbers of Paley graphs, Quaestions Math., 11 (2), 1998, 225-231.
- [7] S. Graham, C. Ringrose, Lower bounds for least quadratic non-residues, Analytic number theory (Allerton Park, IL, 1989), 269-309.
- [8] T. Tao and V. Vu, Additive combinatorics, in Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 2006), Vol. 105.
- [9] N. Alon, On the capacity of Digraphs, Europ. J. Combinatorics, 1998, 19, 1-5.